

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 8268	
10/811,296 03/26/2004		03/26/2004	Kalpana Bhandari	03108/0201072-US0		
7278	7590	12/13/2004		EXAMINER		
DARBY &		P.C.	NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O			
NEW YOR		0150-5257		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1621		

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application I	No.	Applicant(s) BHANDARI ET AL.					
	Office Action Commons	10/811,296							
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Chukwuma C		1621					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the co	over sheet with the d	correspondence a	ddress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION misions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, l a reply within the statutory ariod will apply and will ex tatute, cause the applicati	however, may a reply be tir minimum of thirty (30) day pire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONE	mely filed /s will be considered time the mailing date of this ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on								
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-	final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
4)	Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> are subject to restriction and	or election requir	ement.						
Applicat	ion Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note	the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	eign priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
-/	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum			ion No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents	s have been receive	ed in this Nationa	l Stage				
	application from the International Bu	•							
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified	d copies not receive	ed.					
Attachmen	ıt(s)								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
- =	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail Di	ate Patent Application (PT	O-152)				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date	6)	_		· · ,				

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Group I. Claims 1-2 and 8, drawn to a N-aryloxypropanolyl-N'-phenethy urea of general formula 3 and its composition, classified in class 564, subclass 32.
- Group II. Claims 3-7, drawn to a method of preparation of a N-aryloxypropanolyl-N'-phenethy urea of general formula 3, classified in class 564, subclass 24+.
- Group III. Claim 9-15, drawn to a method for treating obesity, classified in class 514, subclass 588.

It should be noted that claims 11-15 are nonstatutory and for purposes of the restriction requirement, the Examiner has interpreted them as method of use claims.

Inventions Group I (claims 1-2 and 8) and Group II (claims 3-7) are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as the process disclose in WO 00/35875.

Inventions Group I (claims 1-2 and 8) and Group III (claim 9-15) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be

Art Unit: 1621

practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process of using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as those compounds disclose in EP 0 955 293 A1.

The invention of Groups I-III are independent and patentably distinct because there is no patentable co-action among the various groups and a reference anticipating one member will not render another obvious.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and as shown by their different classification, a search of the three groups designated above would impose an undue burden upon the examiner, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is therefor proper.

A telephone call was made to Sandra Lee on 11/30/04 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicants' are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a

Art Unit: 1621

matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 1621

Page 5

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha, Ph.D. Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1621 November 30, 2004

Johann R. Richter, Ph.D., Esq. Supervisory Patent Examiner, Technology Center 1600